

Mr. MORSE. There was a great deal of concern about it in the Committee on Foreign Relations. In fact, the committee discussed it as recently as day before yesterday with State Department officials.

It happened to be my responsibility to ask for it, but as chairman of the subcommittee I asked for the preparation of a detailed memorandum, to be followed by a conference, in respect to the problem in Brazil, about which we have all been hearing or reading so much in the newspapers. We will get that detailed memorandum, and we will be briefed in respect to what steps are being taken by way of negotiations in respect to the problem.

This is one of the most troublesome of all the issues confronting us in Latin America. I shall comment upon it very briefly.

The Senator may recall that in 1960 the Senator from Vermont [Mr. ARKEN] and I filed a report with the Senate in respect to what our policy should be in connection with the so-called government monopolies which are being operated by various countries; such as Mexico, in respect to oil; Brazil, in respect to oil; and at one time the Argentine—and they may get back into it, for who knows what will happen?

One of the great dangers which confronts us is the successful propaganda of the Communists that if we seek to influence the Latin American countries against government monopolies we are seeking to participate in economic intervention. It is true that in many places in Latin America the leaders are as much concerned about economic intervention as they are concerned about military intervention. We must find some balance.

I happen to be one who is opposed to nationalization of industry, yet I would be less than honest if I did not frankly recognize that if some foreign country wishes to nationalize its industry it has a sovereign right to do so.

The question is, if it involves American property, what will be done diplomatically to see to it that adequate compensation—and I underline the word "adequate"—is paid for the property which is expropriated.

I have no knowledge in regard to the progress which has been made in connection with the Brazilian incident. I am confident, if they go ahead with the program of taking over the utilities involved, that there is no question about the position our Government will take; that is, compensation will have to be adequate.

I am a strong believer in that. I shall have something to say before I finish in respect to certain Latin American problems which relate to it.

I now wish to finish the part of my speech which deals with disarmament.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, before the distinguished Senator leaves the Latin American part of his speech—and particularly the colloquy between him and the distinguished Senator from Idaho—I wonder if he will yield to me for a question.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator discussed the bipartisanship or nonpartisanship approach which the Foreign Relations Committee uniformly takes toward measures. The Senator recalls, I am sure, that the late distinguished Senator from Michigan to whom he referred, Senator Vandenberg, who was a very able member and a very able chairman of that committee, used to refer to it as "unpartisanship."

He took the viewpoint that there should be no partisanship whatsoever. In other words, he distinguished even as against the term "bipartisan," because he wanted it to be absolutely unpartisan.

Is it not the feeling of the Senator from Oregon that during all those years, particularly since shortly after the end of World War II, when Senator Vandenberg exercised such great leadership in bringing about this nonpartisan feeling, the Committee on Foreign Relations has acted in that respect with reference to all questions before it?

Mr. MORSE. There is no doubt of it. The leadership of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], our present chairman, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is the ranking Democrat on the committee next to the chairman, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who are the ranking Republicans on the committee—and I shall say something further about them in a moment—has given us the assurance that in the committee we shall follow the Vandenberg policy of what the Senator has referred to as "unpartisanship," and which I refer to as "nonpartisanship."

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield to me further, I would particularly like to call to the attention of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] a point of which he knows, I am sure, but one that is pertinent at this time. The Senator from Oregon has talked about some of the various forces that play upon the final determination of an issue involving our international relations with any particular country.

The Senator from Oregon omitted one particular force. It is something that I think has played a very great part in international relations over the last several years. That has been the frequent consultation between the executive branch—sometimes the President and sometimes the Secretary of State—and the Foreign Relations Committee, and particularly the subcommittees of that committee that serve geographical areas. Elaborating upon that subject, there is a pulling in of congressional representation in connection with international conferences.

I remember when the OAS Conference was held at Punta del Este in connection with the Cuban situation. The distinguished Senator from Oregon, as chairman of the Latin American subcommittee, and the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who was the ranking Republican member of that subcommittee, were invited from the Senate to accompany the Secretary of State. The delegation that went there included

two Representatives from the House. They were my colleague from Alabama, Representative ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR., who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Representative CHESTER E. MERROW from New Hampshire, who is the ranking Republican on that committee. The four of them went down to Punta del Este. I was particularly interested in the reports that came back to this country during the time of that Conference.

I do not know whether the point has been called to the attention of the Senator from Oregon, but from time to time during the course of that conference we received reports that the delegation had exercised a great influence on that conference. I had the pleasure of being at the White House when the delegation returned. I heard the President pay his respect to the work that had been done down there. He called the names of the four congressional representatives who went to that conference and paid his respects to the work that they had done.

Later, when Secretary of State Rusk was making his remarks, he likewise called the names of the four representatives and mentioned what they had accomplished. At times the part that has been played by the fine cooperation and coordination between the executive and legislative branches of our Government has been overlooked.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad to have the comments of the Senator from Alabama. I wish to say a word about my Republican colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee. As the Senator knows, the ranking Republican member of that committee and, when the Republicans controlled Congress, the chairman of the committee, is the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. Many times when we have had rather vigorous discussion in the committee, the Senator from Alabama has heard him say, "Will someone tell me what is in the best interests of our country?"

That is the only thing that counts. It is the attitude that the Senator from Wisconsin has taken as the ranking Republican member of the committee. He richly deserves the high commendation that I now give him.

I should like to refer to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who is the ranking Republican member of my Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs. The Senator from Iowa would be the first to agree with me that on a great many domestic issues he and I do not always vote the same in the Senate. I suppose the majority of times we do not vote together. But it has been a thrilling experience to serve with him over the years on the committee designated to examine Latin American problems. We were joint delegates to the Bogotá Conference in 1960 that brought out the Act of Bogotá, which was really the forerunner of Punta del Este and the Alliance for Progress program. It was really the forerunner of the increasing acceptance on the part of the Latin American countries—at least their governments—of the essentiality of self-help programs on their part if they are

April 19

ing to expect the American people to help them further.

I wish to pay my very high tribute to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] because he, too, asked the question, What do the facts show the public interest to be? It is in that spirit that we have worked cooperatively in the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, before the colloquy I had with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I was discussing the paradoxical situation in which we find ourselves in respect to the resumption of atmospheric testing. I had made the point that we must make the choice among degrees of immorality. That is difficult. I have made clear that I support the President's program for the resumption of limited atmospheric testing if the Russians are not willing to accept an enforceable control system. Every indication is that they are not. I had already made the point that while we were negotiating in good faith at Geneva, the Russians were obviously negotiating in bad faith and shocking deception, because at the very time they were negotiating, they were preparing their bombs for testing.

I had made the point that atmospheric nuclear testing is immoral if we are to evaluate the question from the standpoint of its effects upon mankind. It is pretty shocking to sit and listen to the scientists tell us what fallout is bound to do to the human organism, although scientists dispute among themselves as to the degree of damage the fallout will cause. I have never talked with one of them who, when pressed under cross examination, was not willing to admit that it would be much better for mankind if none of the damage were done.

Atmospheric testing is immoral, in my judgment, but there is another thing more immoral connected with the nuclear issue. It would be so much more immoral for the Government of the United States and the people of the United States to make the mistake of not keeping themselves in a position where Khrushchev would understand that he has everything to lose and nothing to gain by all-out nuclear war. If we let him get such a lead, then my major premise, to which I referred earlier in my speech, might go into effect and have application. I repeat it. That major premise is that if the Communist segment of the world ever thinks that if the Communist segment of the world ever thinks that the Western Powers, particularly the United States, are permitting themselves to get into such a weakened defense position that the Russians can knock them out quickly in a nuclear war, and survive themselves, they would try that step.

Therefore, wrestling as one does with his conscience in this matter and communing with one's God—and I offer no apology for saying that—I have had no hesitancy in reaching the conclusion that the President should and must be supported.

I am very happy to note that the American people by and large recognize that fact. At the same time, as a re-

ligious people we feel that in some way, somehow, reason will come to prevail in the Russian minds and that they will be willing to sit down with us and negotiate the kind of disarmament agreement the President so nobly and eloquently presented once again to the American people yesterday.

That is my general position on disarmament. I am pleased to give my support to the Senator from Minnesota, who honors me with his presence as acting majority leader this afternoon, and to say to him once again that I believe the speech he made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon is a speech that not only the American people will have to come back to time and time again, but is also a speech the premises of which must be accepted by the leaders of the nations of the world if we are to leave to our grandchildren the heritage of freedom to which I have referred.

Some say to me, "Mr. Senator, you keep on saying that we have got to do this to buy time."

Some, not so kind, have said to me, "Mr. Senator, you keep saying that we have got to have more time, but will you tell us how much time we can risk?"

I cannot answer that question, other than to say that, so long as there is hope, no other course is open to us.

I cannot imagine our making the mistake of changing this course of action which is giving so much hope to so many millions of people in the so-called weaker countries. They themselves recognize the fact that their hope for survival is for the United States, eventually with our Western allies, to lead the nations of the world to an enforceable disarmament agreement.

Once in a while I hear critics of the United Nations deplore the fact that many much smaller nations and much more underdeveloped nations than the United States have an equal voice in the United Nations with the United States. They seem to think that some great danger lurks in that fact.

I have sat in the United Nations. I wish to say that in the General Assembly the doctrine of equality, as far as votes are concerned, is one of our great strengths. I am not one of those who would give to the militarily mighty in the United Nations a greater voice than I would to smaller nations. I have seen those smaller nations operate. They recognize that their only hope for survival is putting into international practice the ideals of a Roosevelt and a Vandenberg and the program of a Truman.

We have a cause that stands upon its merits. When we talk on these international problems in the United Nations, we do not have to worry about the acceptability of the merits of our case.

I sat there during the session when Khrushchev came to the United Nations in a rage, because he had to leave the Congo or be thrown out by the United Nations. The great Dag Hammarskjold made perfectly clear to the Russians, when they were trying to move into the Congo, that unless they moved out they would be moved out. I have always thought that that was one of the main

reasons for Khrushchev's high state of rage when he came to New York and made for the first time his troika proposal which attempted to hamstring the effectiveness of the General Assembly.

I close this section of my speech by saying that I want the Record to show that I support the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and give full and complete support to the President of the United States in regard to his program both in the field of testing and in the field of disarmament.

There are other developments in American foreign policy that concern me very much in these hours. So I close my speech with the last section, which deals with some problems of Latin America. I speak in the capacity of my chairmanship of the subcommittee that deals with Latin American affairs.

There are thousands of Cuban exiles in the United States. No one could give greater support to their admission to the United States than the senior Senator from Oregon. In keeping with the spirit of the words engraved on the Statue of Liberty, we once again open our doors to the oppressed. We have become a great refuge and escape asylum for them. I am proud of it as an American. I am in favor of continuing to give them this haven of security. However, I speak most respectfully when I say that they, too, have responsibilities and obligations, which they in turn owe to the United States. Therefore, I am concerned when I pick up the New York Times and read a headline:

a headline: "Ex-Castro Officers Build Force in the United States."

The article reads, in part:

WASHINGTON, April 18.—A compact guerrilla force built around former officers of Premier Fidel Castro's army is being organized in Florida and Puerto Rico for eventual action against the Cuban regime.

According to Cuban informants, this force has been in preparation since last summer and may soon be ready for action.

Its aim is to enter Cuba and engage in guerrilla operations at an opportune time—possibly if local uprisings occur as a result of the deterioration of the island's economic and political situation.

The group's recruiting headquarters is in Miami, and most of its training is conducted in Florida on an individual basis. The new guerrilla force has no direct connections, however, with the U.S. Government.

The bulk of this force is made up of officers and men who were prevented for political reasons from participating in the rebel invasion of Cuba a year ago yesterday. The Central Intelligence Agency was in charge of that invasion attempt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EX-CASTRO OFFICERS BUILD FORCE IN UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, April 18.—A compact guerrilla force built around former officers of Premier Fidel Castro's army is being organized in Florida and Puerto Rico for eventual action against the Cuban regime.

According to Cuban informants, this force has been in preparation since last summer and may soon be ready for action.

Its aim is to enter Cuba and engage in guerrilla operations at an opportune time—possibly if local uprisings occur as a result of the deterioration of the island's economic and political situation.

The group's recruiting headquarters is in Miami and most of its training is conducted in Florida on an individual basis. The new guerrilla force has no direct connections, however, with the U.S. Government.

The bulk of this force is made up of officers and men who were prevented for political reasons from participating in the rebel invasion of Cuba a year ago yesterday. The Central Intelligence Agency was in charge of that invasion attempt.

The objection against these men last year was that although they were violently anti-Communist and anti-Castro, they favored certain aspects of the Cuban social revolution. Many of them had broken out of Cuban prisons to reach the United States.

A large segment of the new force is made up of men identified with the People's Revolutionary Movement. This movement is headed by Manuel Ray, who, during the 1961 invasion, belonged to the Cuban Revolutionary Council. The abortive attack was staged in the name of this council.

However, an estimated total of 170 volunteers from the Revolutionary Movement were kept out of the invasion force after arriving at the staging area in Guatemala. Others were kept in Miami.

ALL-CUBAN OPERATION

The basic concept of the new guerrilla group is that all anti-Castro activities should be conducted and directed by Cubans and not by United States citizens. For the time being the only desire of these Cubans is that the United States grant them freedom of movement to aid them at a later stage, should the need arise.

Recently, informants said, Col. Ramon Barquin, a Cuban regular army officer and formerly military adviser to Señor Ray, agreed to head the new force.

Colonel Barquin, who now lives in Puerto Rico, where he operates a boys' military academy, has just finished a lecture tour of South America.

His top aids are reported to be Col. Martin Helena, who was chief of staff of the 1961 invasion army until he was deposed by a rightwing revolt in the Guatemala training camps, and Capt. José Lopes Legon, who was head of the movement's military camp in Florida.

Another contingent participating in the new force is the so-called "Huber Matos Garrison" group. This force is made up of officers of Premier Castro's "Rebel Army"—the official name of the Cuban military establishment—who served under Maj. Huber Matos in Camaguey Province in 1959.

At that time, Major Matos tried to resign his post in protest against the Communist infiltration in the army. He was arrested by Dr. Castro and sentenced to 30 years in prison.

OFFICERS ESCAPED

Most of his officers were jailed, but succeeded in fleeing to Miami in 1960. Although they offered their services to the invasion army, they were kept out, reportedly on orders of the CIA. Their leader is Capt. Napoleon Becker.

The main advantages of the new group are that most of the members have guerrilla experience and that they have acquaintances among the officers in Dr. Castro's rebel army in Cuba.

Intelligence reports have indicated that numerous officers and men in the Cuban army—and even in the militia, are in sympathy with anti-Castro movements. But the reports say they must be given to join the ranks of an active opposition.

The new guerrilla group rules out political ties with any Cuban refugee group and plans

to operate primarily as a military entity. Some of its men are civilian underground specialists in sabotage.

CASTRO FOE SLAIN

KEY WEST, FLA., April 18.—Havana radio said today that Premier Castro's force had shot down a counterrevolutionary in an abortive attempt that was made under instructions from U.S. Intelligence Agency agents at the Guantanamo Naval Base.

The announcement of the death of the counterrevolutionary, Heriberto Rodriguez Pena, followed a report by the Havana radio that anti-Castro elements had taken refuge at the U.S. Naval Base and were agitating for weapons to fight the Cuban Government.

The Rodriguez case is the second official report in as many days of action against counterrevolutionaries.

The Havana broadcast said Senor Rodriguez was shot several days ago in Santiago de Cuba. The city is an important port about 40 miles southwest of Guantanamo Bay.

Yesterday the radio reported the slaying of Osvaldo Ramirez Garcia, a top counterrevolutionary who was reported to have been active against the Castro regime since mid-1959.

FREED PRISONERS ARRIVE HERE

Seven Cuban prisoners arrived at New York International Airport yesterday and made an emotional appeal for funds to liberate the 1,119 prisoners still being held by Premier Castro.

About 300 persons, some of them relatives of the prisoners, cheered the men as they stepped off a plane from Miami. The greeters shouted in Spanish, "Long live free Cuba" and "Down with communism."

All seven prisoners had been seriously wounded or sick, and some were on crutches.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have checked with the State Department, as was my duty upon a reading of that article. I have been assured that there is no United States involvement in or knowledge of such training operations in Florida. I made it perfectly clear that I intended to make a statement today in regard to whatever response I got from the State Department. I am satisfied that the State Department is dealing with me forthrightly, accurately, and honestly concerning this subject. Therefore, I have made this statement.

But in the April 19 issue of the Washington Star, I read another item which disturbs me. The dateline is "San Juan, P.R., April 19," and the article reads as follows:

A Cuban exile leader, Col. Ramon Barquin, called last night for the use of U.S. Marines to liberate Cuba from Fidel Castro's Red regime.

Mr. Barquin, onetime Cuban military attaché in Washington, told newsmen that Marines had been used in Latin American nations in the past and should be employed to free his country.

He made his remarks after returning from a 2-day trip to Miami, where it was reported he had conferred with heads of the People's Revolutionary Movement on plans for possible anti-Castro warfare.

Yesterday afternoon the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], participated with me—and I referred to the incident earlier in my speech—in the making of a video tape to be shown later in respect to an article written by the Governor of Puerto Rico, the Honorable Luis Munoz-Marin, and to be published in the May issue of

Reader's Digest. I speak for myself when I say I was a little surprised in that program to find the undertone—and not too much of an undertone—that perhaps the time had come when there ought to be participation by the United States in some kind of invasion of Cuba. I felt that a distinguished Cuban exile who participated with us in the program did not speak out against such a proposal as I think Cuban exile leaders should speak out.

Delicate as this subject is, I feel that it is my duty, in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, to reject and repudiate any thought or proposal of U.S. invasion of Cuba. I have some right to speak on this subject, because I led the fight in this body some years ago against U.S. support of Batista. It was the public hearings held by my subcommittee in January 1958, as the Record will show, that brought out the admission by the State Department that Batista could not remain in power without U.S. military aid. We who knew anything about Latin America knew that that was true. Some of us had for some time dared to challenge such aid by this country. Some of our problems in Latin America have been caused by too much exportation of bullets rather than bread to that area of the world. Many of the problems in Latin America have been caused by the American military interventions of the past, and we have been decades in living it down. Only in recent years has there developed a better understanding of what was meant when Franklin Roosevelt initiated the good-neighbor policy.

But the fear by Latin America of American military intervention has plagued us for decades. I think we must make it crystal clear at this hour that Cuban exile leaders, who, in my judgment, are betraying the obligation they owe their sanctuary, are presenting propaganda that is no part of American foreign policy. Yet I am concerned at how many persons seem to think—for I get their letters—that the way to handle Castro is to go in and conquer his country with American military might.

I say I have the right to speak on this subject because not only did I lead the fight in this body against the Batista regime, but I was the first, and the first for some time, to speak out against Castro, because it was clear to me almost from the beginning that Castro was adopting totalitarian procedures—and I judge a government by its procedures. The procedures of a government determine whether people are free. Governments can have the finest sounding constitutions; but unless those constitutions are implemented by procedures which guarantee freedom, they become but scraps of paper. We all know that the problem of implanting freedom in Latin America is a long-pull proposition. It will not be possible to press any button, whether it is for the Alliance for Progress program or any other type of program, and have freedom in Latin America overnight.

What must be made crystal clear to Latin America and the rest of the world

April 19

at all times is that the United States has no intention of violating its treaty obligations; has no intention of conducting a unilateral military action anywhere in Latin America, including Cuba; but does have the intention of carrying out its share of the joint responsibilities under the charter of this hemisphere, the Charter of the Organization of American States. That was the purpose of Punta del Este. That was the purpose of the council meeting of the Organization of American States in Washington a few weeks ago, following Punta del Este. The time has come to make it perfectly clear to the Cuban leaders who are in exile in the United States that this country is no place for them to stir up, by way of their propaganda—a considerable amount of which, upon checking, is found to be false—a public opinion which would seek to lead our Government into unilateral military action in Cuba.

No one could hate the Communist regime of Castro or any other Communist regime more than I do; but it is my view that if we participate in exporting freedom under the Alliance for Progress program, political freedom will take root in Latin America, and Latin America will gradually become a haven of economic and political freedom for the mass of the people there, and communism in Cuba will rot on the political vine.

In passing, Mr. President, we should note what some of the inevitable results of unilateral action by our country would be. I am convinced that there is no danger of it, for any administration in our country would make a colossal mistake if it let the Cuban exile propagandists lead us into military action in Cuba.

First, Mr. President, let me make clear that if any aggressive course of action were to be taken against the United States by Cuba or through Cuba, by Russia, Red China, or any of the other members of the Communist bloc, there would be no question as to what our position then would be. However, there is a great deal of difference between being a defender against aggression and becoming an aggressor, regardless of the nature of the political sovereignty against which a country engaged in such aggression, whether it be Communist, Fascist, or of some other political ideology. The Cuban exile leaders who are advocating an American invasion of Cuba are proposing that the United States become an aggressor, in violation of all its treaty commitments—those under the OAS Treaty, the Rio Treaty, the Caracas Treaty, and the other treaties to which our Nation's signature has been affixed.

Mr. President, not one more hour should be allowed to pass without our registering a protest, here in the Senate, against the propaganda activities in this country by some of the Cuban exile leaders. But such activities are not limited to the Cuban exile leaders.

Yesterday, there was submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a statement by the Honorable Spruille Braden, a member of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee. I wish to comment

briefly on it, because I want the Record to leave no room for doubt that I reject and repudiate the major premises of his statement. If our country ever were to follow the foreign policy advocated by Mr. Braden in that statement, we would overnight, lose our friends around the world, for his statement cannot be reconciled with the glorious foreign-policy record of our country—a foreign policy based upon defense of our rights, but not based upon aggressive action. In a moment I shall refer in detail to his statement; but, first, let me point out what the newspapers yesterday and today have stated about it.

I read the following from the Washington Star of yesterday:

BRADEN URGES CUBA INVASION

Spruille Braden, a former U.S. Ambassador to Cuba, said today an invasion by U.S. military forces is the only way to rid the Caribbean country of communism.

"If we wipe out the Communists in Cuba," Mr. Braden said, "they will fall everywhere else in the Americas."

Mr. Braden told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in a prepared statement that approval of President Kennedy's 10-year, \$20 billion Alliance for Progress program of aid to Latin American countries would be "a criminal waste of the taxpayers' money."

"The first, imperative, and for the moment the only thing to do," he said, "is immediately and quickly to drive communism out of Cuba and then out of the rest of the hemisphere, including our own country."

That is completely irresponsible talk by Mr. Braden.

I read further from the article:

URGES FULL ATTACK

Mr. Braden continued: "The only way to rid that island of Soviet domination and Communist control, not to mention Castro, is to give our leadership and with our patriotic and courageous Cuban and other Latin American friends to organize an all-out invasion by the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Corps, and Marines."

In addition to his Cuban assignment, Mr. Braden has been Ambassador to Colombia and Argentina and was Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs in the Truman administration. He made his statement to the committee as a member of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.

Mr. President, the rest of the article does not deal with Mr. Braden, so I shall not read it now. But so there may be no question about the accuracy of my reporting, I ask that the remainder of the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the remainder of the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CHAMBER ASKS CUT

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce recommended today a \$1,088,100,000 cut in President Kennedy's \$4,878,500,000 foreign aid program in earlier testimony.

Its spokesman, John O. Teeter, of New York, asked, in addition to the slash a concerted effort "to strengthen the role of private enterprise" in underdeveloped countries and more effective action to coordinate worldwide programs to stop duplication and waste.

Mr. Teeter, vice president of Pfizer International, Inc., was among a score of witnesses invited to appear for the committee's final day of hearings on the foreign aid authorization measure, on which the committee will start voting next week.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for the purpose of additional emphasis, I call special attention to one paragraph of Mr. Braden's statement. On page 8 of his statement, as submitted to the committee, he said:

If we wipe out the Communists in Cuba, they will fall everywhere else in the Americas. The only way to rid that island of Soviet domination and Communist control, not to mention Castro, is to give our leadership and with our patriotic and courageous Cuban and other Latin friends to organize an all-out invasion by the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Corps, and Marines.

Mr. President, let us consider for a moment that hypothesis. Let us assume that utter madness overcame our judgment, and that as madmen we followed such a course of action. What would be our justification in terms of international law, or in light of our commitments under the OAS Charter and under the Rio Treaty, the Caracas Treaty, and the other treaties to which we are signatory; and what would be our answer in the United Nations when a resolution of condemnation was introduced, and when it was asserted that we had violated treaty after treaty under which we had pledged ourselves to follow a nonaggressive course of action?

The Braden philosophy—and let me say it is held by too many persons in this country—is the philosophy of a return to the point of view that might makes right. It never has, and never will.

I am satisfied that the information I have received in my capacity as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee is correct when I have been told by our military and other experts that an attempt at such an invasion in its early stages would cost a minimum of 40,000 lives of American boys.

When the cause is just and right, there is no question of what the American people and the American military will do by way of sacrifice; but my answer to Mr. Braden is that he could not possibly justify in the pages of American history a sacrifice of a minimum of 40,000 lives of American boys, in the early stages of the invasion, when that cause would be unjust and wrong so far as American foreign policy is concerned.

I think the time has come when we no longer can take in silence the insidious and invidious propaganda program going on in our country to sell the American people the proposition that we ought to seize Cuba.

In closing, let me say that we can seize Cuba. But there would be sacrifices that cannot be justified in such a course of action, which would go down in history as international outlawry. And would we be ready, Mr. President, to face the consequences in the rest of Latin America? Would we be ready to lose the support of the masses of the people of Latin America for decades? Would we be ready to face the great crisis that would mount as one government after another toppled in Latin America?

The Bradens and their ilk are strengthening the Communist cause in Latin America by the irresponsible sponsorship of an aggressive course of action on the part of the United States of

Department officials that the State Department's failure to act was due to the fact that the State Department official who usually handled such matters had been on his vacation, and upon his return—thinking that Governor Egan's telegram referred to an earlier situation which had passed he had therefore done nothing.

Meanwhile, I tried to reach the Secretary of the Navy, who was out of town, and left word as to the situation, and thereupon the Navy was officially alerted.

A more favorable and, I think, a more correct view of the situation and of Governor Egan's action was taken by station WTOP, Washington, D.C., in an editorial of Wednesday evening, April 18, over both TV and radio, which editorial was repeated the morning of April 19. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The incident of the Japanese fishing boats in Shelikof Strait off the State of Alaska seems to prove one thing for sure—which is that the State Department had better make it a practice to move with somewhat more than deliberate speed in the handling of Alaskan fishing complaints.

It can be argued that Alaska's Gov. William Egan exceeded his authority when he ordered the impounding of a couple of Japanese vessels in the Shelikof Strait, which is the narrow body of water between the Alaska mainland and Kodiak Island.

But it can also be said that officialdom here in Washington might have prevented an unpleasant little episode if there had been less ponderous movement toward getting the dispute settled.

In a phone conversation with Senator Ernest Gruening, Governor Egan reported that he wrote the State Department to complain about the presence of Japanese fishing boats on March 30 and followed up with a telegram on April 2. Then, the Governor said, when he checked back with the Department on April 9, he found that little if any action had been taken. And, the Governor explained further, when a Department representative finally showed up in Alaska to see what was going on, he said he would need 3 weeks to furnish his report—by which time the fishing boats would be loaded and gone.

There seems to be considerable disagreement about the various legal implications of the presence of the Japanese fishermen in the strait. However, there is no doubt that Alaskans are genuinely disturbed about what they consider to be encroachments by Japanese—and Russians as well—in the State's territorial waters. Under these circumstances, the State Department ought to ring a loud alarm bell when and if future cries for help from Alaska are received here.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am happy to report, however, that the State Department appears now to be taking a more energetic attitude. I was informed yesterday by Secretary Ball that the prosecution in the Alaska courts will proceed without objection by the State Department and that an emphatic demand will be made of the Japanese to keep out of Shelikof Strait until a legal determination may be made as to the right—which the government of Alaska affirms—of Alaskans to consider these

waters to be domestic, and not international, waters.

It is my view that Governor Egan deserves commendation for acting as and when he did. In the circumstances it was the only way to bring an intolerable situation to a head and to clarify the issues. It is my hope that the State Department will now insist vigorously on the protection of our American interests in Alaska.

I would like to say, also, that I am hopeful that the Japanese, with whom the State of Alaska is developing most useful and mutually beneficial commercial relations, will take a reasonable view of this situation and accommodate themselves to Alaska's position. We in Alaska appreciate Japan's problems. Japanese capital has, in part, financed a most useful enterprise, a pulp mill in Sitka; the Japanese are exporting Alaskan lumber and are further interested in the acquisition of various of Alaska's raw materials, minerals, oil, and other vital resources, which they lack, and which Alaska would be willing to sell. We hope that this developing commercial intercourse and an otherwise friendly relationship will not be jeopardized.

However, it is, in my opinion, the almost unanimous view of Alaskans that the invasion of our traditional Alaskan fishing grounds by foreign vessels, would be intolerable. I heartily support that view. Shelikof Strait is only one of these fishing grounds.

What really should be secured, besides an affirmation of these rights, is the extension of our fishing grounds to a 12-mile limit. The 3-mile limit is an obsolete provision dating from days when 3 miles was the approximate distance a cannonball from a shore battery could hit a hostile vessel.

I ask unanimous consent that three articles from the Anchorage Daily Times of Monday, April 16, 1962, reporting on the seizure of these Japanese vessels, be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE TAKES TWO VESSELS, ARRESTS THREE CAPTAINS

KODIAK.—A second Japanese fishing boat has been seized and the captains of three Japanese fishing vessels charged in Alaska Superior Court with poaching in Alaska waters.

The seizure of the vessels and the arrests brought immediate reaction from the Japanese Government in Tokyo. Officials there called on the U.S. Government to make a full report of the incident.

The move by Alaska State officials climaxes years of dissension over fishing by the Japanese in waters claimed by Alaska.

The seizure of Japanese fishing fleet vessels began Saturday night when Capt. E. L. Mayfield of the Alaska State Police boarded the 65-foot herring catcher *Ohtori Maru No. 5* at the mouth of Ugank Bay in Shelikof Strait.

The *Ohtori Maru's* skipper, Tadao Higashima, was charged with fishing commercially without a license and without having registered his gear or boat. The *Ohtori Maru* was escorted to Kodiak by the Alaska State Fish and Game Department vessel *Teal* and held in lieu of \$25,000 bond.

A second boat, the *Shoishi Maru No. 7* was boarded in Shelikof Strait last night and escorted to Kodiak by the Alaska Fish and Game Department vessel *Widgeon*.

The *Shoishi Maru's* skipper, Tadashi Abe, was charged with violating Alaska's inland waters.

The 2 seized Japanese boats were part of a fleet of 5 accompanied by a 1,772-ton mother ship, the *Banshu Maru*, which has 123 people aboard. Alaska officials claim the Japanese have been taking herring in Shelikof Strait for about 2 weeks.

The *Banshu Maru's* captain, Mongo M. Hanasaki, also was charged with fishing commercially without having notified the State.

Judge Davis, who flew to Kodiak from Anchorage yesterday, released Tadao and Hanasaki on condition they return for a later hearing.

The only casualty of the incident occurred last night when Sgt. Gerald Williams, of Anchorage State Police Department, slipped and broke a leg while boarding the *Shoishi Maru*. He was evacuated to Kodiak by a U.S. Coast Guard rescue plane.

In Washington, officials said today the question of Japanese fishing operations in waters claimed by Alaska is in the process of being resolved. Until the United States determines whether the waters are U.S. territory, officials would not comment on the weekend incidents.

In Tokyo, the Japanese Foreign Office said it had cabled the Embassy in Washington to ask for a full report from the U.S. Government on the incident. Officials said the Japanese Government would protest if it found the Japanese ships had not violated territorial waters.

Also in Tokyo, a spokesman for the Taiyo Fisheries Co., which owns the vessels, commented:

"We have ordered the fleet to operate at least 5 miles off the coast of the United States, 2 miles outside the accepted territorial water boundary. We are confident no violation is involved."

Shelikof Strait, varying in width from 30 to 19½ miles, lies between Kodiak Island and the Alaska Peninsula. Alaska claims it as inland waters, reasoning that it is an extension of Cook Inlet. Kodiak Island lies off the southern tip of the Kenai Peninsula, which forms the eastern shore of Cook Inlet.

Gov. William A. Egan of Alaska said the strait "traditionally has been an inland body of water." He said it had been regulated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service before Alaska was a State and by the State ever since statehood.

Egan wrote and wired George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, asking the Federal Government to act when the fleet was first sighted. He said this week's action was taken without notification to Federal authorities, because he had not received any satisfaction from them.

The Governor said he was in telephone contact yesterday with the Departments of State and Justice. In Washington, neither Department would comment.

Alleged poaching by Japanese fishermen has been a hot issue in Alaska for at least 25 years. In 1938, the Alaskan delegate in Congress, ANTHONY DIMOND, even suggested that the United States bomb Japanese fishing boats encroaching on Alaska waters. Tension continued until and after World War II, but this is believed to have been the first time arrests were made.

TWO CAPTAINS PROMISE TO RETURN

KODIAK.—Two Japanese fishing vessel captains arrested Saturday night in Shelikof Strait for alleged violation of Alaska fishing regulations were released following their arraignment here yesterday on condition they

America against Cuba. I recommend the prevailing American foreign policy in Latin America. It is a policy of statesmanship and reality. It is a policy of keeping faith with our ideals and being true to the signature we have affixed to one treaty after another in Latin America. It is a policy whereby we say, in furthering the Roosevelt and the Truman good neighbor policy, the Eisenhower: people-to-people policy, the Kennedy Alliance for Progress policy, "We seek to be partners with you in the cause of establishing a system of economic freedom for the masses of the people of Latin America, out of which will develop political freedom and all the precious rights of individual freedom and dignity that men and women should enjoy."

The Punta del Este conference, in effect, quarantined Cuba. The Punta del Este conference in effect laid the foundation for the implementation of the Punta del Este program throughout the rest of the hemisphere. The Punta del Este conference was a pledge by the free nations of the American States to work jointly together to resist the spread of Castro communism, which we all know is fed and nurtured by the Marxist-Leninist line as set forth in Russia. But the Punta del Este conference did not advocate war. The Punta del Este conference made perfectly clear, Mr. President, that the way to peace in the Western Hemisphere is not by way of war.

I have all the sympathy that one could have for the patriots of Cuba who have fled Cuba to the United States, but I close by saying to their leaders, "In my judgment, you are not true to your obligations under the sanctuary granted you when you seek to use American soil as a propaganda platform to encourage the United States to follow a foreign policy course of action which is foreign to our ideals and inconsistent with our glorious history."

I hope, Mr. President, I have made myself unequivocally clear that, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin-American Relations, I shall continue to do all that I can to implement the Alliance for Progress program, and I shall continue to stand out against those who aid and abet communism in Latin America, however unwillingly and unknowingly, by advocating American unilateral military action against Cuba. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

GOVERNOR EGAN'S CORRECT COURSE IN SEIZING JAPANESE FISHING VESSELS IN ALASKAN WATERS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, upon the initiative of Gov. William A. Egan, of Alaska, the State of Alaska has seized two Japanese fishing boats that were fishing in Shelikof Strait, located between Kodiak Island and the Alaskan mainland.

The invasion of Alaska's fishing grounds by foreign vessels—Japanese and Russian—in recent months has been a very sore point with the people of Alaska. The fisheries—salmon, halibut,

herring, king crab—have been and are Alaska's principal economic resource and industry. The economy of Alaska's long Pacific Ocean and Bering Sea coastlines, with their numerous communities from Ketchikan at the lower end of the Panhandle to Bristol Bay, depends upon it. It is the livelihood, directly or indirectly, of all the people who live there—and the overwhelming majority of Alaska's communities is coastal.

My reason for taking the floor on this subject is because of what I consider to be the mistaken views and assumptions expressed in an editorial published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Wednesday, April 18, which was highly critical of Governor Egan's action. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA ON ITS OWN

Gov. William A. Egan of Alaska apparently needs to be reminded that Alaska joined the Union and did not become an independent nation. His seizure of two fishing vessels during the last few days in Shelikof Strait and the arrest of the captain of another Japanese boat on charges of fishing without a license were undertaken without the advice or consent of the State Department. The Governor took upon himself the responsibility for creating an international incident that appears to be beyond his jurisdiction.

In defense of his action Governor Egan contends that Shelikof Strait between the Alaska Peninsula and Kodiak Island is an inland body of water. But this seems to be in conflict with the view of the Department of State. The Government has asserted no claim that this Strait, which varies in width from 21 to 30 miles, constitutes inland waters, and it would doubtless be very difficult to get such a claim recognized if it did so. Of course, Alaska has no standing to assert independent claims on questions of this sort.

The State does have authority, under an act of Congress, to control fishing off its shores out to the traditional 3-mile limit of sovereign jurisdiction recognized by the United States. Some reports are to the effect that one boat was seized 1 mile inside these territorial waters, and the controversy over where the seizures took place may have to be settled in court. Apart from this, however, Governor Egan has handled the problem with little regard for its delicacy.

Mr. Egan did protest to the State Department against what he regarded as illegal fishing from a Japanese fleet in Shelikof Strait. Both the State and Interior Departments sent men to consult with the Governor and investigate the alleged violations. Instead of waiting until they could report their findings in Washington, Governor Egan acted against the Japanese fishermen without so much as notifying the State Department of his intention. Whatever the final outcome may be, he needs to be taught a lesson to the effect that international relations are handled by the Department of State.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is Governor's Egan's view, which I share, that he felt compelled to act because of the inability to get appropriate and timely action by the State Department.

I telephoned Governor Egan Wednesday morning to read him the Post's editorial. Governor Egan informed me, first, that in practice the waters of Shelikof Strait has always been considered Alaskan waters. He stated to

me categorically that a in territorial days these waters had been subjected to the regulation of the Federal agency charged with that responsibility—the Fish and Wildlife Service. Since statehood these functions have been assumed by the corresponding State agency, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

When the Japanese fishing fleet began invading these waters, Governor Egan wrote the State Department on March 30 and followed it up with a telegram on April 2. Hearing nothing, he telephoned Acting Secretary George Ball on April 9. To the Governor's surprise and consternation, Acting Secretary Ball had no inkling of the previously sent letter and telegram. At Governor Egan's insistence, the State Department sent a representative to Alaska. However, this representative said it would require some 3 weeks for him to make up his mind whether the Japanese fishing was illegal.

By that time, Governor Egan naturally feared that the Japanese boats would have secured their catch of fish and departed, or, if succeeded by other fishing vessels in the absence of any restraining action, would come into contact with Alaskan fishermen, who would be reaching these areas in their own boats, with possibly unfortunate consequences. It should be noted that our Alaskan fishermen are subject to strict regulation in the interest of conservation. Foreign vessels can and do flout those conservation regulations, and can, in a few weeks, destroy the painstaking compliance of our own fishermen, and the efforts of our regulatory agencies.

Certainly by Governor Egan's prompt action he eliminated the possibility of violence, with casualties and loss of life, which in past decades has occurred between Alaskan and Japanese fishermen in analogous circumstances.

In addition to that, it was clear that at least one of these boats, if not more, had actually been fishing within the 3-mile limit.

I would say that I had a similar experience, which may be pertinent, some months ago.

On that occasion I was informed by Governor Egan that Russian fishing vessels were in Alaskan territorial waters and that he had sent a telegram to the Secretary of State, asking the Department of State immediately to notify the Navy and the Coast Guard to send out appropriate vessels or planes in order to observe these operations and see whether they were violative of law and treaty arrangements. This took place on a Tuesday. On Thursday, wishing to satisfy myself as to what the facts were, I telephoned Admiral Caldwell at Kodiak, Alaska, commandant of the 17th Naval District and of the Alaska Sea Frontier. To my amazement, he had received no word whatever from the State Department, and my phone call was his first appraisal of the situation.

I immediately telephoned the Acting Secretary of State, but was unable to reach him for a few hours. It was only upon my very urgent insistence that I finally was able to talk to him by phone. He said he would look into the matter. Subsequently, I was informed by State